

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in view of the present amendments and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

This amendment is submitted in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.116, which after final rejection permits entering of amendments canceling claims, complying with any requirement of form expressly set forth in a previously Office Action, or presenting rejected claims in better form for consideration on appeal. The present amendment places the claims in condition for allowance, and does not raise new issues requiring further search and/or consideration. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the present amendment be entered under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116.

Claims 9-20 are pending. Claims 9, 12-14 and 19-20 are amended. No new matter is introduced.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Feld (U.S. Patent No. 6,281,755, hereafter “Feld”); Claims 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Feld in view of Kaczynski (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2007/0111684); Claims 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Feld in view of Shohara (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0078743); Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Feld in view of Kasuga (U.S. Patent No. 4,524,422); Claims 15 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Feld in view of Kasuga and Daners (U.S. Patent No. 6,229,393); Claims 17 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Feld in further view of Kasuga and Kaczynski; and Claims 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Feld in view of Kasuga and Shohara.

In reply to the rejection of Claim 9 as being anticipated by Feld, Claim 9 is amended to recite, *inter alia*, and amplifier that includes:

an amplification device, *an output terminal of the amplification device being an output terminal of the amplifier*;

an LC parallel resonant circuit connected in parallel to the amplification device; and

an LCR series resonant circuit connected in parallel to the amplification device and the LC parallel resonant circuit.
(Emphasis added).

The applied reference, Feld, describes a high-frequency power amplifier that feeds an antenna of a nuclear magnetic resonance tomography apparatus.¹ Felds also describes that the power amplifier includes a circuit to alter maximum power output depending on frequency.² Feld illustrates an output matching network (8) connected in series with the output side of an amplifier stage (2) and a load impedance (G_l) connected in series with the output matching network (8).³ The load impedance (G_l) is a guideline impedance representing the impedance of the antenna.⁴ Thus, the high-frequency power amplifier of Feld outputs maximum power to the antenna, represented in Feld as G_l .

However, Feld does not describe that the output side of the amplifier stage (2) is the output side of the high-frequency power amplifier. Instead, Feld describes that the matching network (8) includes a parallel resonant circuit connected in parallel with the output side of the amplifier stage (2) and a series resonant circuit (22) connected *in series with the output side of the amplifier stage (2)*. As Feld describes that the high-frequency power amplifier supplies maximum power to the antenna (represented by G_l), the output of the high-frequency power amplifier is the point between the series resonant circuit (22) of the matching network

¹ Feld at column 2, lines 55-60.

² Feld at column 2, lines 60-65.

³ Feld at column 5, lines 40-60; see also Figure 2.

⁴ Feld at column 5, lines 50-55.

(8) and the antenna load (G_1).⁵ In other words, the series resonant circuit (22) is interposed between the output side of the amplifier stage (2) and the output of the high-frequency power amplifier. Conversely, amended Claim 9 recites that an output terminal of amplification device is an output terminal of the amplifier. Therefore, Feld fails to disclose the claimed amplification device, and Claim 9 is believed to be in condition for allowance, together with its corresponding dependent claims. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of amended Claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn.

As all other rejections of record rely upon Feld for describing the above-distinguished features, and the above-distinguished features are not disclosed or suggested by Feld alone or in combination with any other art of record, it is respectfully submitted that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been presented. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejections of Claims 10-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

For the reasons discussed above, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance for Claim 9-20 is earnestly solicited.

⁵ See Figures 2 and 5 of Feld.

Should, however, the above distinction be found unpersuasive, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner provide an explanation via Advisory Action pursuant to M.P.E.P. § 714.13 specifically rebutting the points raised herein.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Aldo Martinez", is written over a horizontal line.

Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)

Aldo Martinez
Registration No. 61,357